



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,276	04/12/2004	James Alfred White		5667
7590 JAMES ALFRED WHITE 909 HWY 1204 PINEVILLE, LA 71360-2912		09/16/2008	EXAMINER PETERSON, KENNETH E	
			ART UNIT 3724	PAPER NUMBER PAPER
		MAIL DATE 09/16/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/822,276	Applicant(s) WHITE, JAMES ALFRED
	Examiner Kenneth Peterson	Art Unit 3724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 July 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. .
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other:

1. The amendment filed 12 Sep 05 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows:

The recitation that the drive spindle employs American Standard Uniform Thread Form. No suggestion of this can be found in the disclosure as originally filed.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

On line 5, a --to-- is needed between "functioning" and "cut".

Line 10 should be changed to --said means for slicing comprising a cutting element attached--.

On line 17, "such means" should be changed to --said supporting means--.

On line 20, "the" should be changed to --a--.

On line 30, before "a drive support", the following should be added; --said means for rotating the potato comprising--

On line 32, "the" should be changed to --a--.

On line 35, "a" should be changed to --said--.

On line 58, "a common" should be changed to --the common--.

Appropriate correction is required.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant recites that the spindle uses American Standard Uniform Thread Form. However, in his remarks filed 19 March 08, Applicant indicates that he starts with American Standard Uniform Thread Form and the crest of the threads were ground down. Once the crests are ground, they no longer conform to the American Standard Uniform Thread Form.

Accordingly, it is not clear what weight should be given to these recitations.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ross (2,464,993), who shows:

A means for slicing having a cutting element 9,

a blade support 4;

a means for supporting a potato being a potato supporting guide (20) having a first lock nut (left side, figure 1) via threads,

a means for rotating the potato having a drive support (5),
a drive spindle (22),
a means for manual rotation (24,25),
a drive nut guide (27,28,29) positioning a drive nut (32),
a means for driving with a drive element (34),
a common mounting element 3 having two counter stop elements (6) and 4 support elements (8).

Ross does not disclose a lock nut to hold the drive element (34) onto the spindle. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is ubiquitous for lock nuts to be employed to attach one element to another. For example, Ross himself teaches the use of lock nuts to hold an element on (20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Ross by providing a lock nut to hold the drive element on, as suggested by Ross himself.

Ross does not disclose what standard he uses for his threading. Examiner takes Official Notice that it is well known to employ American Standard Uniform Thread Form in machinery such as this. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Ross by making his threadings employ American Standard Uniform Thread Form, as is well known, based upon its general availability.

7. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues the obviousness of using American Standard Uniform Thread Form. However, Examiner can find no basis in the disclosure as originally filed for Applicant to even claim this feature, thus the arguments are moot.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth Peterson whose telephone number is (571)272-4512. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on (571)272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kenneth Peterson/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724